

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

CommScope, Inc., CommScope Inc. of North Carolina, and CommScope Technologies, LLC,) Civil Action No. 19-cv-15962-JXN-LDW)

Plaintiffs,

V.

Rosenberger Technology (Kunshan) Co. Ltd.,¹ Rosenberger Asia Pacific Electronic Co., Ltd., Rosenberger Technology LLC, Rosenberger USA Corp., Rosenberger North America Pennsauken, Inc., Rosenberger Site Solutions, LLC, Rosenberger Hochfrequenztechnik GmbH & Co. KG, Northwest Instrument, Inc., and CellMax Technologies AB,

Defendants

**CONSOLIDATED INDEX IN
SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION
TO SEAL JANUARY 25, 2024
HEARING TRANSCRIPT**

¹ Rosenberger Technology (Kunshan) Co., Ltd. is also known as PROSE Technologies (Suzhou) Co., Ltd., and Rosenberger Technology, LLC is also known as PROSE Technologies, LLC.

I. Documents submitted in connection with the January 25, 2024 Hearing Transcript (ECF No. 573).

Document	Basis for Sealing	Clearly Defined and Serious Injury that Would Result if the Relief is Not Granted	Why a Less Restrictive Alternative to the Relief Sought is Not Available	Party in Opposition to Sealing, if any, and Basis
January 25, 2024 Hearing Transcript (ECF No. 573) (at 57-68)	These portions of the Transcript reveal confidential and nonpublic information about unauthorized access to a portion of CommScope's IT infrastructure that CommScope determined was the result of a ransomware incident. The portions reveal information that is not public about the incident, including the potential impact of the breach and subsequent investigation. (Bourke Decl. ¶ 2).	Disclosure of this information would cause clearly defined and serious injury to CommScope because it would reveal confidential and non-public information about CommScope's investigation into a recent ransomware incident and the impacted information. (Bourke Decl. ¶ 3).	Redacted version of transcript proposed that may be filed publicly.	Defendants do not oppose the motion to seal.

Document	Basis for Sealing	Clearly Defined and Serious Injury that Would Result if the Relief is Not Granted	Why a Less Restrictive Alternative to the Relief Sought is Not Available	Party in Opposition to Sealing, if any, and Basis
January 25, 2024 Hearing Transcript (ECF No. 573) (at 74-96)	These portions of the transcript reveal discovery information that has been designated Attorneys Eyes Only and Confidential under the Discovery Confidentiality Order (ECF No. 22). (Bourke Decl. ¶ 2).	Disclosure of this information would cause clearly defined and serious injury to CommScope because it would reveal discovery information that has been designated Attorneys Eyes Only and Confidential under the Discovery Confidentiality Order. (Bourke Decl. ¶ 3).	Redacted version of transcript proposed that may be filed publicly.	Defendants do not oppose the motion to seal.
January 25, 2024 Hearing Transcript (ECF No. 573) (at 9-57)	This portion of the Submission reveals discovery information that has been	Disclosure of this information would cause clearly defined and serious	Redacted version of transcript proposed that may be filed publicly.	Plaintiffs do not oppose the motion to seal.

Document	Basis for Sealing	Clearly Defined and Serious Injury that Would Result if the Relief is Not Granted	Why a Less Restrictive Alternative to the Relief Sought is Not Available	Party in Opposition to Sealing, if any, and Basis
	designated Attorneys' Eyes Only and Confidential under the Discovery Confidentiality Order (Dkt. 22).	injury to Rosenberger because it would reveal discovery information that has been designated Confidential under the Discovery Confidentiality Order (Dkt. 22) (Yu Decl. ¶ 4.)		
January 25, 2024 Hearing Transcript (ECF No. 573) (at 11)	These portions of the Submission include excerpts from Exhibit 26 and confidential information related to Defendants' cost and expenses related to this litigation.	Disclosure of this information would cause clearly defined and serious injury because it would allow public disclosure of the nature of confidential and	Redacted version of transcript proposed that may be filed publicly.	Plaintiffs do not oppose the motion to seal.

Document	Basis for Sealing	Clearly Defined and Serious Injury that Would Result if the Relief is Not Granted	Why a Less Restrictive Alternative to the Relief Sought is Not Available	Party in Opposition to Sealing, if any, and Basis
		sensitive communications with third-parties retained for purposes of this litigation and/or work product. (Yu Decl. ¶ 4).		